

Serial No.: 09/820,589  
Office Action Date: 03/10/2005

Filed: 03/30/2001  
Amendment Date: 5/24/2005

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Subsequent to the Office Action issued on 3/10/2005, claims 1-3 are pending in the Application.

The Office Action objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) as failing to show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Replacement drawing sheets are submitted herewith. No new matter has been added by the replacement drawing sheets. However, Applicants respectfully traverse the objections with reliance upon the following support.

The Office Action specifically recited a plurality of items and inferred that they were missing from the drawings. Each will be addressed herein in the same order as presented in the Office Action. The "integrated tool", as the name suggests, comprises individual features found throughout the drawings and does not lend itself well to a parsing. Nevertheless, reference to paragraphs 19 and 20 of the specification will be instructive in understanding the nature of the "integrated tool" which includes the significant features illustrated at one level of detail in FIG. 1 of the business process 14 (as modeled), application tool 16, interactive process-application scripts 22 and interactive application features 24. Additionally, deeper and diverse detail levels of, for example, the business process model are found in the various Figures 7-9 which exemplify a particular embodiment relative to a work order business process. The "model of a business process" is, as just indicated, shown in Figures 7-9 with respect to the work order process example. Paragraph 19 makes this clear, also. "Stages defined by a series of roles and tasks linked to an application system" can be clearly seen in the Figure 7 *stages* (draft stage, edit stage and process stage) appearing at the base of the drawing. The *roles and tasks* correspond to, for example, the descriptors in each of the four boxes 61-64 of Figure 7 and the underlying deeper detail as exemplified in Figures 8 and 9. The *application system* refers to system aspects which again include varietal reference

to the drawings including, significantly, the application tool 16, network 15 and workstation 27 hardware. In this regard, "interface" also includes such aspects as the workstation 27 and network 15 in the Figures. Paragraph 28, for example, further describes the user learner 21 access therewith, in further support of such features being shown in the drawings. One skilled in the art will furthermore recognize this as a conventional interface, including such graphical user interface features as are described throughout the specification. "Steps of the business process" are clearly shown in the exemplary work order process deeper details of Figure 9 (see paragraphs 31) and in the supplementary function learning of the distribution list of Figure 6 (see paragraphs 24 and 30). "Cross functional link" is observed in Figure 3, more particularly in the action scenario 72 linking and return to and from distribution list scenario 43 via paths C and D. "Supplementary function" is similarly observed all along the right hand side of Figure 3 (boxes 38-47) as further described in paragraphs 29 and 30, for example. Finally, the "task scenarios" and "action scenarios" are shown in Figure 8 and additionally Figure 9 in the case of "action scenario." The whole of Figure 8 represents the exemplary work order "task scenario" whereas "action scenarios" are specifically referred to in Figure 8, items 72-74, which items link the user to the respective "action scenarios" in Figure 9. Paragraph 31 further makes this clear.

From the above, it should be clear that the drawings are not deficient in showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Applicants therefore respectfully request retraction of the objection and acceptance of the submitted Replacement Sheets.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. More particularly, the Office Action recites a number of instances where the language is generally alleged to be unclear, awkward or confusing. Most of the areas questioned correspond to

the alleged missing items from the drawings. Applicants verily believe that a reexamination and comparison of the claims to the drawings and specification as now clarified in this paper will provide sufficient basis for retraction of the rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicants respectfully offer assistance to the Examiner by way of a telephone call if questions respecting Applicants' compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph remain subsequent to the requested reexamination.

Finally, claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Worden (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0149934 A1), hereafter "Worden." Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and request complete retraction thereof.

The Office Action makes clear that the rejection is being made under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as it existed prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA35 U.S.C. § 102(e)). Pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) states, in pertinent part:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless . . . (e) the invention was **disclosed in a patent** granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

Since Worden is merely an application publication (no patent having issued thereon), neither exception to patentability based on reliance upon Worden is appropriate. Worden is not effective as 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) prior art.

Based on the above, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and Applicants pray that same be allowed to proceed to issue.


If the Examiner has any questions regarding the contents of the present response, or if Applicants have somehow misunderstood the present application of Worden, Applicants' attorney respectfully requests the courtesy of a telephone

**Serial No.: 09/820,589**  
**Office Action Date: 03/10/2005**

**Filed: 03/30/2001**  
**Amendment Date: 5/24/2005**

conference for further clarification prior to issuance of any subsequent Office Action to provide Applicants the opportunity to amend the present response within the statutory period. Applicants' attorney may be reached at the phone number appearing below.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Vincent A. Cichosz  
Registration No. 35,844  
Telephone: (248) 676-2798

Serial No.: 09/820,589  
Office Action Date: 03/10/2005

Filed: 03/30/2001  
Amendment Date: 5/24/2005

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

The attached Replacement Sheets of drawings correspond to original sheets 1/5 through 5/5 inclusive. These sheets replace all original drawing sheets.

Applicants have submitted the Replacement Sheets to generally improve the readability and reproducibility thereof.

Applicants are both facsimile transmitting and mailing the present response (including Replacement Sheets).

Attachment: Replacement Sheets